




PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional) 8071-187T (OPF20010119US)			
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)] on _____ Signature _____ Typed or printed name _____	Application Number 09/995,766	Filed 11/29/2001			
	First Named Inventor Jang-Kun Song				
	Art Unit 2629	Examiner Shapiro, Leonid			
<p>Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.</p> <p>This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.</p> <p>The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.</p> <p>I am the</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"><tr><td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top; padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/> applicant/inventor. <input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. 48,909 Registration number _____ <input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____</td><td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top; padding: 5px; text-align: center;"> _____ Signature Nathaniel T. Wallace _____ Typed or printed name 516-692-8888 _____ Telephone number September 21, 2007 _____ Date</td></tr></table> <p>NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.</p>				<input type="checkbox"/> applicant/inventor. <input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. 48,909 Registration number _____ <input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____	 _____ Signature Nathaniel T. Wallace _____ Typed or printed name 516-692-8888 _____ Telephone number September 21, 2007 _____ Date
<input type="checkbox"/> applicant/inventor. <input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. 48,909 Registration number _____ <input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____	 _____ Signature Nathaniel T. Wallace _____ Typed or printed name 516-692-8888 _____ Telephone number September 21, 2007 _____ Date				
<input type="checkbox"/> *Total of _____ forms are submitted.					

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. **SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: Jang-Kun Song Examiner: Shapiro, Leonid
Serial No.: 09/995,766 Group Art Unit: 2629
Filed: November 29, 2001 Docket: 8071-187T (OPP0101190US)
For: **LCD PANEL, LCD INCLUDING SAME, AND DRIVING METHOD
THEREOF**

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Examiner:

In response to the Advisory Action dated September 4, 2007, Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request. This request is being filed with a Notice of Appeal and a Pre-Appeal Brief Request For Review Form (PTO/SB/33).

REMARKS

Please consider the following reasons for this Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review.

Claims 24, 27-29, 32, and 33-35 are pending. Claims 24, 26, 29 and 31 are the pending independent claims. Of the independent claims, Claims 24 and 29 stand rejected. Only rejections pertinent to independent Claims 24 and 29 are addressed substantively here.

Claims 24 and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin et al. (USPN 6,429,842) in view of Kim (USPN 6,400,424), and further in view of Kawaguchi (USPN 6,677,925). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Shin, Kim, and Kawaguchi teach or suggest all the limitations of Claims 24 and 29.

Claims 24 and 29 claim, *inter alia*, “supplying the common electrode lines with a swinging common electrode voltage; and supplying an overshoot voltage to a voltage applied to each pixel in response to the first data voltage and the second data voltage upon a variation of a level of the swinging common electrode voltage, wherein a level of the voltage applied to each pixel is varied in response to the overshoot voltage.”

Shin discloses TFTs formed in a zig-zag pattern centering around the respective gate lines, as shown in FIGS. 6, 7A, and 7B and the description of col. 3, lines 33-45. Shin does not teach or suggest “supplying an overshoot voltage to a voltage applied to each pixel in response to the first data voltage and the second data voltage upon a variation of a level of the swinging common electrode voltage, wherein a level of the voltage applied to each pixel is varied in response to the overshoot voltage” as claimed in Claims 24 and 29.

Kim discloses common electrode lines 6 disposed between two adjacent gate lines 2 (see for example FIGS. 2 and 3). However, Kim does not disclose a top substrate common electrode of the present invention, much less “supplying an overshoot voltage to a voltage applied to each pixel in response to the first data voltage and the second data voltage upon a variation of a level of the swinging common electrode voltage, wherein a level of the voltage applied to each pixel is varied in response to the overshoot voltage” as claimed in Claims 24 and 29.

Indeed, as noted in the Final Office Action, Shin and Kim do not disclose supplying an overshoot voltage to data voltage upon a variation of a level of the swinging common electrode voltage, wherein a level of the voltage applied to each pixel is varied in response to the overshoot voltage.

Referring now to Kawaguchi in combination with Shin and Kim, Kawaguchi teaches that the amplitude of a common electrode signal (a common voltage) Vcom can be suppressed to cause the voltage waveform applied to the common electrode Tcom to conform with the rectangular-shaped reference voltage waveform (see for example, col. 18, lines 29-35). As shown in FIG. 2 of Kawaguchi, the common voltage Vcom is applied to both a liquid crystal capacitor C_l and a supplementary capacitor C_s. However, since the Claims 24 and 29 relate to a method for driving a liquid crystal display having an independent wiring structure (see for example, page 4, lines 6-9 of the specification), a liquid crystal capacitor C_{lc} is supplied with a top substrate common electrode voltage V_{CF-com} (corresponding to the common voltage of the Kawaguchi) and a storage capacitor C_{st} is supplied with a swinging common electrode voltage from a common electrode line. At this time, the top substrate common electrode voltage V_{CF-com} is a DC voltage (about 2.5V) (see Equations 4-9, and FIG. 5). That is, a structure of a liquid crystal display device of Kawaguchi is different from that of the present invention, wherein a

voltage applied to the storage capacitor Cst differs from that applied to the liquid crystal capacitor Clc. Kawaguchi only teaches that the common voltage swings as shown in FIGS. 3 and 4, and that the swing common voltage is applied to the liquid crystal capacitor Cl (see FIG. 2) that is also supplied with a data voltage. Kawaguchi does not teach or suggest a separate an overshoot voltage, much less "supplying an overshoot voltage to a voltage applied to each pixel in response to the first data voltage and the second data voltage upon a variation of a level of the swinging common electrode voltage, wherein a level of the voltage applied to each pixel is varied in response to the overshoot voltage" as claimed in Claims 24 and 29. Thus, Kawaguchi fails to cure the deficiencies of Shin and Kim.

The combined teachings of Shin, Kim, and Kawaguchi teach a driving circuit for reversal of liquid crystal voltages. The combined teachings of Shin, Kim, and Kawaguchi fail to teach or suggest that "supplying an overshoot voltage to a voltage applied to each pixel in response to the first data voltage and the second data voltage upon a variation of a level of the swinging common electrode voltage, wherein a level of the voltage applied to each pixel is varied in response to the overshoot voltage" as claimed in Claims 24 and 29.

For at least the foregoing reasons, there is believed to be clear error in the rejection of Claims 24 and 29 based on combined teachings of Shin, Kim, and Kawaguchi; reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 27, 28, 32, and 33 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawaguchi, Shin, and Kim as applied to Claims 24 and 29 above, and further in view of Moon et al. (USPN 6,421,039). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Kawaguchi, Shin, Kim and Moon teach or suggest all the limitations of Claims 27, 28, 32, and

33.

Claims 27 and 28 depend from Claim 24. Claims 32 and 33 depend from Claim 29. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claims 24 and 29. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the present application, including Claims 24, 27-29, 32, and 33-35 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 21, 2007

/Nathaniel T. Wallace/
Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicants

Mailing Address:
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889